

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03159 01 OF 06 091343Z

41

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03

INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03

SS-20 USIA-15 NEA-10 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04

AEC-11 AECE-00 OMB-01 SAM-01 DRC-01 (ISO) W

----- 048790

P 091222Z APR 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2398

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 6 VIENNA 3159

FOR US REP MBFR

EO 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPS APRIL 8, 1974

REF: VIENNA 3158

FOLLOWING IS CONTINUATION OF REPORT OF INFORMAL SESSION WITH  
EASTERN REPS ON APRIL 8, 1974. PARAGRAPHS 1 THROUGH 7 CON-  
TAINING SUMMARY TRANSMITTED REFTEL.

8. UK REP, WHO WAS SERVING AS HOST, WELCOMED PARTICIPANTS.  
HE SAID THE AGREED PURPOSE OF PRESENT SESSION WAS TO DEFINE  
THE GROUND FORCES OF BOTH SIDES AND ASKED US REP TO LEAD OFF  
DISCUSSION. KHLESTOV INTERJECTED THAT HIS UNDERSTANDING OF THE  
PURPOSE OF THE PRESENT MEETING WAS THAT IT SHOULD DEFINE THE  
COMPONENT ELEMENTS COMPRISING GROUND FORCES, AIR FORCES AND  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03159 01 OF 06 091343Z

UNITS EQUIPPED WITH NUCLEAR WEAPONS ON EACH SIDE, SO THAT EACH

SIDE WOULD HAVE A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF WHERE THESE COMPONENT PARTS BELONGED. HE THOUGHT THE SIMPLEST WAY TO PROCEED WOULD BE FOR ALLIED REPS TO IDENTIFY THE COMPONENT PARTS OF THEIR OWN FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE WHICH BELONGED TO THE GROUND FORCES, AIR FORCES AND NUCLEAR EQUIPPED UNITS. EASTERN REPS FOR THEIR PART WOULD STATE WHAT COMPONENT PARTS THEY CONSIDERED WERE COMPRISED IN THE GROUND FORCES, AIR FORCES AND IN NUCLEAR EQUIPPED UNITS.

9. US REP SAID THIS APPROACH WAS A CHANGE FROM WHAT HAD BEEN AGREED DURING THE LAST INFORMAL SESSION. THE PRESENT DISCUSSION HAD GROWN OUT OF A DISCUSSION ON THE LAST OCCASION WHEN KHLESTOV HAD MENTIONED THE ALLIES HAD GIVEN FIGURES FOR GROUND FORCES ON BOTH SIDES AND HAD THEN ASKED HOW THE ALLIES DEFINED GROUND FORCES. THIS LAST TOPIC WAS WHAT THE ALLIES HAD AGREED TO PURSUE ON THE PRESENT OCCASION, AND ALLIED REPS PROPOSED TO TELL EAST NOW HOW THEY DEFINED GROUND FORCES. EASTERN REPS SHOULD IN RETURN TELL ALLIES IF THEY FOUND ANY DIFFICULTIES WITH THIS DEFINITION. EASTERN REPS WOULD REMEMBER THAT ALLIED REPS HAD ORIGINALLY SUGGESTED DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES AND EXCHANGE OF CONNECTED DATE. EASTERN REPS HAD SAID THAT THEY WISHED TO DISCUSS A DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES FIRST. ALLIED REPS HAD RESPONDED THAT IN ORDER TO BE HELPFUL THEY WERE WILLING TO DISCUSS FIRST WHAT CONSTITUTED GROUND FORCES. HE BELIEVED IT WOULD BE MOST CONSTRUCTIVE TO STICK TO THIS APPROACH. ALLIED REPS WOULD DISCUSS HOW THEY DEFINED GROUND FORCES. EASTERN REPS COULD IN RETURN INFORM ALLIED REPS OF ANY DIFFICULTIES THEY MIGHT SEE IN THE ALLIED DEFINITION AND PRESENT THEIR OWN DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES. THIS WAS WHAT HAD BEEN AGREED TO IN THE LAST INFORMAL SESSION. US REP SAID THAT, IN DEFINING GROUND FORCES, ALLIED REPS WOULD GIVE THEIR OWN DEFINITION AND TELL EAST WHAT FORCES THEY HAD INCLUDED. HE BELIEVED THIS WOULD MEET A STATED EASTERN INTEREST.

10. KHLESTOV SAID IT MIGHT WELL BE THAT BOTH SIDES HAD NOT UNDERSTOOD EACH OTHER PRECISELY. WHAT HE HAD HAD IN MIND WAS TO HAVE A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT ELEMENTS EACH SIDE HAD IN MIND WHEN THEY WERE DISCUSSING GROUND AND AIR FORCES. HOWEVER, AFTER ALL, IT DID NOT REALLY MATTER WHICH APPROACH WAS TAKEN AS LONG AS ONE CONCENTRATED ON THIS SUBJECT. CZECHOS-

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03159 01 OF 06 091343Z

LOVAK REP SAID THAT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD TURN IN THE FUTURE TO DEFINITION OF THE AIR FORCES SINCE THE AIR FORCE STRUCTURE WAS LINKED SO CLOSELY WITH GROUND FORCES.

11. US REP SAID HE INTENDED ON PRESENT OCCASION TO DESCRIBE THE APPROACH THE ALLIES HAD TAKEN TO THE DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES. HE WISHED TO POINT OUT BEFORE STARTING THAT HIS EXPLANATION WAS NOT EXHAUSTIVE; ALLIES HAD OMITTED SOME MINOR DETAILS

BECAUSE THEIR INCLUSION WOULD HAVE MADE THIS PRESENTATION TOO UNWIELDY.

12. US REP SAID, IN DEFINING GROUND FORCES, THE ALLIES HAD PROCEEDED FROM THE FACT THAT, LEAVING ASIDE NAVAL FORCES AS HAD BEEN AGREED, ALL NATO MILITARY FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE WERE EITHER IN THE ARMY OR IN THE AIR FORCE. IN NATO TERMINOLOGY FOR THESE NEGOTIATIONS, THE TERM "GROUND FORCES" WAS SYNONYMOUS WITH THE TERM "ARMY FORCES." THE ALLIES HAD COUNTED AS GROUND FORCES ALL ARMY PERSONNEL IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS. THEY HAD APPLIED THE SAME CRITERION TO BOTH SIDES THAT IS TO SAY, THE DEFINITION OF NATO GROUND FORCES WHICH THE ALLIES HAD USED COMPRISED ALL ARMY PERSONNEL ON ACTIVE DUTY IN THE UNIFORMED SERVICES OF NATO COUNTRIES WHO WERE LOCATED IN BELGIUM, THE FRG, LUXEMBOURG, AND THE NETHERLANDS. SIMILARLY, THE DEFINITION OF WARSAW PACT GROUND FORCES THE ALLIES HAD USED COMPRISED ALL ARMY PERSONNEL ON ACTIVE DUTY IN THE UNIFORMED SERVICES OF THE WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES WHO WERE LOCATED IN THE GDR, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, AND POLAND.

13. US REP STATED THAT THERE WERE OF COURSE SOME DIFFERENCES ON BOTH SIDES IN HOW CERTAIN FORCE ELEMENTS WERE ORGANIZED. THAT IS, SOME COUNTRIES ASSIGNED CERTAIN MILITARY FUNCTIONS TO ONE UNIFORMED SERVICE, WHILE CERTAIN OTHER COUNTRIES ASSIGNED THE SAME FUNCTION TO ANOTHER UNIFORMED SERVICE. HE WOULD IDENTIFY A NUMBER OF THESE DIFFERENCES NOW AND SHOW HOW ALLIES HAD DEALT WITH THEM. US REP CONTINUED THAT AMBASSADOR KHLESTOV HAD ASKED HOW THE NATO ALLIES COUNTED AIR DEFENSE TROOPS ON BOTH SIDES. THE ALLIES WERE AWARE THAT THERE WERE DIFFERENCES IN THE WAY VARIOUS COUNTRIES ASSIGNED AIR DEFENSE TROOPS AND HAD TAKEN ACCOUNT OF THESE DIFFERENCES IN APPLYING THE DEFINITIONAL RULES THAT HE HAD JUST DESCRIBED. ALLIED FIGURES FOR NATO GROUND FORCES INCLUDED THOSE AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL WHO BELONGED

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 03159 01 OF 06 091343Z

TO NATO ARMIES. THEY DID NOT INCLUDE THOSE AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL OF NATO COUNTRIES WHO BELONGED TO THE AIR FORCES. SIMILARLY, ALLIED FIGURES FOR WARSAW PACT GROUND FORCES INCLUDED THOSE AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL WHO BELONGED TO THE WARSAW PACT ARMIES, INCLUDING THOSE AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL OF THE NATIONAL AIR DEFENSE ORGANIZATIONS OF WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES WHO WERE IN THE ARMIES OF THOSE COUNTRIES. THE ALLIED FIGURE FOR TOTAL NATO GROUND FORCES DID NOT INCLUDE THE FRG PERSHING SQUADRONS BECAUSE THEY HAVE FROM THE BEGINNING BEEN A PART OF THE FRG

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03159 02 OF 06 091513Z

41

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03

INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03

SS-20 USIA-15 NEA-10 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04

AEC-11 AECE-00 OMB-01 SAM-01 DRC-01 /162 W

----- 015910

P 091222Z APR 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2399

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 6 VIENNA 3159

FROM US REP MBFR

AIR FORCE. ALL OTHER SURFACE-TO-SURFACE MISSILE TROOPS ON BOTH SIDES WERE IN ARMY UNITS AND HAD BEEN COUNTED AS GROUND FORCES.

14. US REP SAID EASTERN REPS HAD ALSO INQUIRED WHETHER ALLIES HAD COUNTED THE FRG TERRITORIAL ARMY TROOPS. THOSE PERSONNEL OF THE FRG TERRITORIAL ARMY WHO WERE ON ACTIVE DUTY HAD BEEN COJNTED IN THE FIGURE GIVEN FOR TOTAL NATO GROUND FORCES. AS REGARDS HELICOPTER UNITS, IN NATO THOSE HELICOPTER UNITS ASSIGNED TO GROUND FORCE SUPPORT WERE ARMY TROOPS AND WERE THEREFORE INCLUDED IN THE FIGURE GIVEN FOR NATO GROUND FORCES. IN THE WARSAW PACT, THESE PERSONNEL WERE PART OF THE AIR FORCES AND WERE THEREFORE NOT INCLUDED IN THE FIGURE GIVEN FOR TOTAL WARSAW PACT GROUND FORCES. TO REPEAT, IN COUNTING GROUND FORCES IN BOTH NATO AND THE WARSAW PACT, ALLIES HAD ADHERED TO THE PRINCIPLE THAT ALL PERSONNEL WHO WERE ASSIGNED TO THE ARMY WERE INCLUDED IN THE GROUND FORCES. THERE MIGHT BE SOME MINOR EXCEPTIONS

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03159 02 OF 06 091513Z

TO WHAT HE HAD SAID, BUT IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO CLARIFY THEM ONLY BY DISCUSSION THE ACTUAL FIGURES.

15. US REP CONTINUED THAT HE DID NOT WISH TO SUGGEST THAT PARTICIPANTS TALK ABOUT DETAINED FIGURES ON THE PRESENT OCCASION. BUT HE WOULD NOTE IN THIS CONNECTION THAT THE ALLIES HAD ALREADY GIVEN EAST FIGURES FOR THE GROUND FORCES OF NATO AND THE WARSAW PACT RESPECTIVELY, AND, WITHIN THOSE TOTAL FIGURES FOR THE GROUND FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION. HE WISHED TO REMIND EASTERN REPS THAT ALLIES STILL AWAITED EASTERN COMMENTS ON THESE FIGURES AND THAT IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO HAVE SOME DISCUSSION OF THESE SOON. IF PARTICIPANTS WERE TO MAKE PRACTICAL PROGRESS IN DISCUSSION ACTUAL REDUCTIONS, THEY COULD ONLY DO SO ON THE BASIS OF AGREED FIGURES, BECAUSE THERE WOULD HAVE TO BE SOME COMMON UNDERSTANDING ON THE FIGURES FOR THE PRESENT FORCE LEVELS OF THE TWO SIDES AS THE STARTING POINT FROM WHICH REDUCTIONS WILL BE CALCULATED.

16. US REP CONCLUDED THAT ALLIED REPS WOULD NOW BE GLAD TO HEAR FROM EASTERN REPS THEIR OWN VIEWS ON THE COMPOSITION OF GROUND FORCES.

17. DURING THE PRESENTATION BY US REP, THERE WAS SOME DISCUSSION WITH THE EAST OF THE PROPER EASTERN EQUIVALENTS OF THE TERM "ARMY" AND THE MEANING OF THE TERM "UNIFORMED SERVICES" WHICH SEEMED TO CAUSE SOME DIFFICULTIES TO EASTERN REPS. KHLESTOV THEN ASKED FOR A BREAK FOR CONSULTATION AMONG EASTERN REPS.

18. FOLLOWING RESUMPTION OF SESSION, KHLESTOV SAID THAT, SINCE PARTICIPANTS' OBJECTIVE WAS TO EXCHANGE VIEWS AND IDEAS ON THE STRUCTURE OF GROUND FORCES, HE WOULD EXPLAIN TO WESTERN REPS THE STRUCTURE OF THE WARSAW PACT FORCES IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS. THE COMPOSITION OF THE WARSAW PACT GROUND FORCES, REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THEY WERE NATIONAL OR FOREIGN FORCES, WAS AS FOLLOWS: MOTORIZED UNITS; TANK UNITS; "ARTILLERY UNITS INCLUDING TACTICAL MISSILES" (SIC); UNITS EQUIPPED WITH MISSILES; ARMY AIR FORCES; AND AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL. THERE WAS ONE EXCEPTION IN THIS LIST ON AIR DEFENSE AS FAR AS ONE COUNTRY WAS CONCERNED, BUT THESE WERE THE BASIC ELEMENTS OF THE GROUND FORCES OF THE WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03159 02 OF 06 091513Z

19. US REP ASKED WHA WAS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE KHLESTOV CATEGORY OF MISSILE-EQUIPPED UNITS AND ARTILLERY UNITS EQUIPPED WITH TACTICAL MISSILES. WHERE WERE THE FROG'S AND SCUD'S? AFTER CONSULTATION WITH SMIRNOVSKY, KHLESTOV SUGGESTED THAT MISSILES BE DROPPED FROM THE ARTILLERY CATEGORY SO THAT THERE WOULD ONLY BE TWO CATEGORIES: "ARTILLERY UNITS" AND "UNITS EQUIPPED WITH MISSILES."

20. US REP ASKED KHLESTOV TO ELUCIDATE THE EXCEPTION HE HAD MENTIONED WITH REGARD TO AIR DEFENSE. DID IT MEAN THAT THE AIR DEFENSE FORCES OF ONE COUNTRY WERE NOT INCLUDED IN THE GROUND FORCES? KHLESTOV RESPONDED THAT THIS WAS THE CASE WITH THE FORCES OF THE GDR. US REP SAID ALLIES WERE AWARE OF THIS DIFFERENCE.

21. UK REP ASKED, AS REGARDS UNITS EQUIPPED WITH MISSILES, WERE THESE SURFACE-TO-SURFACE MISSILES? SMIRNOVSKY REPLIED THAT THIS WAS THE CASE, THE REMAINDER WAS IN THE AIR DEFENSE FORCES. KHLSETOV SAID THIS PINT WAS SUBJECT TO CORRECTION SINCE HE WAS NOT SUPPORTED BY MILITARY EXPERTS ON THIS OCCASION.

22. KHLESTOV CONTINUED THAT EASTERN REPS CONSIDERED IT TO BE OF VITAL IMPORTANCE T HAVE A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING ON THIS ISSUE. PARTICIPANTS WERE SPEAKING OF THE REDUCTION OF THE GROUND FORCES OF NATO AND THE WARSAW PACT, OF ALL ELEMENTS INCLUDED IN THE GROUND FORCES ON BOTH SIDES IT WOULD HELP IN THE FUTURE TO HAVE A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING ON THIS POINT. THIS WAS ALL THE MORE IMPORTANT SINCE, AS A RESULT OF PREVIOUS DISCUSSION OF THIS SUBJECT, IT HAD BECOME CLEAR THAT ALL ELEMENTS OF THE GROUND FORCES WERE CLOSELY INTER-RELATED. PARTICIPANTS HAD COME TO REALIZE THAT BECAUSE OF DIFFERENT ORGANIZTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES IN INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES, DIFFERENT ELEMENTS WERE ASSIGNED TO DIFFERENT SERVICES. AS ALLIED REPS HAD THEMSELVES INDICATED, AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL IN SOME COUNTRIES WERE IN THE ARMY ANDIN OTHERS WERE ASSIGNED TO THE AIR FORCES. SO HE BELIEVED IT WOULD BE USEFUL FOR THE EXPERTS OF BOTH SIDES IN THE NEXT "ROUND" OF NEGOTIATIONS, AS EAST TERMED IT, TO COME TO A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT ELEMENTS SHOULD BE COUNTED UNDER THE AIR AND GROUND FORCES OF BOTH SIDES IN THE AREA, UNDER THEIR ENTIRE ARMED FORCES, EXCEPT FOR THE NAVY, WHICH IT HAD BEEN AGREED SHOULD BE EXCLUDED. ON THE BASIS OF THE WESTERN DIFINITION OF GROUND FORCES, THE EAST HAD COME TO REALIZE THAT WEST HAD NOT INCLUDED  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 03159 02 OF 06 091513Z

THOSE CIVILIANS WHO WERE PERFORMING FUNCTIONS IN SOME OF THE SERVICES.

23. KHLESTOV CONTINUED THAT ALLIES REPS HAD ON THIS OCCASION AGAIN RAISED THE QUESTION OF FIGURES. THE

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03159 03 OF 06 091436Z

41

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03

INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03

SS-20 USIA-15 NEA-10 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04

AEC-11 AECE-00 OMB-01 SAM-01 DRC-01 /162 W

----- 015386

P 091222Z APR 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2400

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 6 VIENNA 3159

FROM US REP MBFR

EASTERN POSITION ON THIS MATTER WAS AS FOLLOWS: AT THIS STAGE OF DISCUSSION AND NEGOTIATION, PARTICIPANTS WERE BASICALLY DISCUSSING THE ISSUE OF WHO WOULD REDUCE THEIR TROOPS AND WHAT BRANCHES OF THE SERVICE SHOULD BE REDUCED. THESE WERE THE POINTS ON WHICH THERE WERE MAJOR DIFFERENCES AND EACH SIDE HAD DIFFERENT VIEWS ON THEM. THEY WERE BASIC ISSUES. ALLIED REPS HAD CITED A NUMBER OF FIGURES. EASTERN REPS ALSO HAD KNOWLEDGE OF FIGURES ALTHOUGH THEY HAD NOT CITED THEM. BUT EASTERN REPS BELIEVED THAT AT THIS STAGE OF THE DISCUSSION, THERE WAS NO NEED TO HAVE A DISCUSSION ON FIGURES OR TO AGREE ON THEM. GENERALLY SPEAKING, EACH SIDE HAD A KNOWLEDGE OF FIGURES ADEQUATE TO PRESENT NEEDS. AS HE UNDERSTOOD IT, FOR THE PRESENT SPECIFIC STAGE OF NEGOTIATION THIS KNOWLEDGE WAS SUFFICIENT FOR CONTINUING THE DISCUSSION OF WHICH COUNTRIES WOULD REDUCE AND WHAT TYPE OF TROOPS WOULD BE REDUCED. AT THIS STAGE OF DISCUSSION, THERE WAS ADEQUATE KNOWLEDGE OF FIGURES.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03159 03 OF 06 091436Z

24. KHLESTOV CONTINUED THAT EASTERN REPS WERE AWARE THAT, WHEN PARTICIPANTS REACHED UNDERSTANDING ON THE TWO CRUCIAL

ISSUES HE HAD JUST MENTIONED, AND WHEN THEY WERE PROCEEDING TO ELABORATE A DOCUMENT ON THE REDUCTION OF FORCES, AT THAT STAGE THEY WOULD HAVE TO OPERATE ON THE BASIS OF AGREED FIGURES. THESE MIGHT NOT BE FIXED IN A DOCUMENT AND MIGHT BE MERELY AN UNDERSTANDING FROM WHICH BOTH SIDES PROCEEDED. THIS WAS WHY IT WAS IMPORTANT AT A SUBSEQUENT ROUND OF NEGOTIATIONS FOR EXPERTS ON BOTH SIDES TO WORK OUT SPECIFIC TERMINOLOGY AS TO WHAT WAS UNDERSTOOD, FOR EXAMPLE, WHEN BOTH SIDES REFERRED TO GROUND OR AIR FORCES. THERE WAS NO REQUIREMENT TO WORK OUT PRECISE AGREED LANGUAGE ON THIS POINT, MERELY THAT BOTH SIDES SHOULD HAVE THE SAME CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT WAS MEANT BY GROUND AND AIR FORCES.

25. US REP SAID, AS HE UNDERSTOOD IT, SOVIET REP WAS SAYING THAT, AT THE LATER STAGE HE HAD SPECIFIED, SOVIET REP BELIEVED BOTH SIDES SHOULD OPERATE ON THE BASIS OF AGREED FIGURES. THESE MIGHT NOT BE PUT IN THE TEXT OF AN AGREEMENT BUT BOTH SIDES SHOULD TRY TO REACH AN UNDERSTANDING ON THE AGREED FIGURES OF FORCES IN THE AREA. DID THIS MEAN THAT AT A LATER STAGE BOTH SIDES WOULD TRY TO AGREE ON THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FORCES IN THE AREA SO THERE WOULD BE AN AGREED STARTING POINT FOR REDUCTIONS?

26. KHLESTOV SAID HE WISHED TO AVOID A CERTAIN POSSIBLE MISUNDERSTANDING. THE EASTERN APPROACH WAS THAT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD DISCUSS AND SETTLE THE BASIC ISSUES OF WHICH COUNTRIES SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN REDUCTIONS AND WHAT KIND OF FORCES SHOULD BE REDUCED. THE TWO SIDES DIFFERED ON THESE POINTS. CONSEQUENTLY, THEY SHOULD WORK ON THESE POINTS FIRST. US REP SAID ALLIED REPS UNDERSTOOD WHAT KHLESTOV HAD IN MIND. IF THESE POINTS WERE RESOLVED, THEN ONE WOULD PRESUMABLY WORK TOWARDS AGREEMENT ON THE NUMBER OF TROOPS IN THE AREA IN ORDER TO KNOW WHAT TROOPS SHOULD BE REDUCED. KHLESTOV REPLIED THAT THE EASTERN APPROACH WAS THAT WHEN PARTICIPANTS REACHED AGREEMENT AS TO WHO SHOULD REDUCE AND WHAT KIND OF FORCES SHOULD BE REDUCED, THEN ONE COULD PROCEED TO REDUCTIONS. AT THAT TIME, AN AGREED PROTOCOL WOULD BE WORKED OUT SAYING WHAT NUMBER OF FORCES WERE TO BE REDUCED. THIS PROTOCOL WOULD BE BASED ON A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING AS TO

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03159 03 OF 06 091436Z

THE NUMBER OF TROOPS TO BE REDUCED AND WHAT THE STARTING POINT WAS. IT WOULD SPECIFY THAT STARTING POINT. (SIC; THIS POINT IS INCONSISTENT WITH KHLESTOV'S REMARK IN PARA 24 AS TO WHETHER STARTING POINT WOULD BE IN WRITTEN DOCUMENT).

27. UK REP ASKED KHLESTOV WHETHER HIS VIEW WAS THAT ONE COULD NOT SPEAK OF THE METHOD AND AMOUNT OF REDUCTIONS UNTIL ONE CAME TO WORKING OUT THE DETAILS OF THE PROTOCOL HE HAD MENTIONED. ALLIED REPS UNDERSTOOD THAT THERE WAS NO AGREEMENT AS YET ON TWO MAIN OPEN ISSUES HE HAD MENTIONED: WHICH COUNTRIES SHOULD



PARTICIPATE IN REDUCTIONS AND WHAT KIND OF TROOPS SHOULD BE REDUCED. BUT KHLESTOV HAD JUST SAID THAT, HAVING REACHED AGREEMENT ON THESE QUESTIONS, PARTICIPANTS SHOULD THEN WORK OUT A PROTOCOL AS TO WHOSE TROOPS SHOULD BE REDUCED, HOW MANY AND FROM WHAT STARTING POINT. UK REP SAID HE WISHED TO MAKE CLEAR THAT ALLIES COULD NOT AGREE ON THE QUESTION OF HOW MANY FORCES SHOULD BE REDUCED UNTIL PARTICIPANTS HAD HAD A DISCUSSION ON THE STARTING POINT. ALLIES COULD NOT DISCUSS REDUCTIONS WITHOUT KNOWLEDGE OF THE STARTING POINT. DID KHLESTOV AGREE WITH THIS VIEW?

28. KHLESTOV SAID HE THOUGHT THERE WERE TWO KEY QUESTIONS WHICH HAD TO BE SETTLED. FIRST, WHO WOULD REDUCE TROOPS AND, SECOND, WHAT KIND OF TROOPS WOULD BE REDUCED. THE ISSUE OF NUMBERS AND FIGURES WOULD NOT INTERFERE WITH THE EFFORTS TO RESOLVE THESE QUESTIONS. THEREFORE, PARTICIPANTS SHOULD NOT COMPLICATE THIS EFFORT. THE ALLIES HAD FIGURES OF THEIR OWN AND THEY COULD WORK ON THEIR BASIS. WHEN THESE TWO MAJOR ISSUES WERE RESOLVED, PARTICIPANTS WOULD HAVE TO DEFINE THE QUESTION OF HOW MANY FORCES WOULD BE REDUCED AND THEY WOULD HAVE A THOROUGH DISCUSSION OF THAT QUESTION.

29. UK REP SAID HE UNDERSTOOD THIS POINT BUT THAT A MAJOR PART OF THE ALLIED CASE WAS DERIVED FROM ALLIED KNOWLEDGE OF THE FIGURES OF THE FORCES ON BOTH SIDES. THEREFORE, DISCUSSION OF THE FIGURES WAS INTEGRAL TO DISCUSSION OF REDUCTION ARRANGEMENTS.

30. KHLESTOV SAID ALLIED CONCEPT WAS BASED ON DISPARITIES IN THE LEVELS OF GROUND FORCES ON EACH SIDE. THIS WAS THE ALLIED STARTING POINT. FOR ITS PART, EAST PROCEEDED FROM THE ASSUMPTION

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 03159 03 OF 06 091436Z

THAT ANY ESTIMATE HAD TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF ALL THE ARMED FORCES IN THE AREA AND OF ALL OF THEIR ELEMENTS. THE ARGUMENTS OF BOTH SIDES ON THIS TOPIC WERE WELL KNOWN.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03159 04 OF 06 091502Z

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03

INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03

SS-20 USIA-15 NEA-10 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04

AEC-11 AECE-00 OMB-01 SAM-01 DRC-01 /162 W

----- 015724

P 091222Z APR 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2401

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 4 OF 6 VIENNA 3159

FROM US REP MBFR

31. UK REP SAID THAT TO CONCLUDE THIS ASPECT OF DISCUSSION, AS US REP HAD SAID AT THE START, ALLIES DID NOT WISH ON THE PRESENT OCCASION TO DISCUSS FIGURES. BUT THEY DID HOPE THAT AT SOME STAGE THEY COULD HAVE EASTERN COMMENTS ON THE FIGURES. THIS WOULD BE NECESSARY AT SOME STAGE. HOWEVER, PARTICIPANTS WERE NOW ENGAGED IN DEFINING THE GROUND FORCES AND HAD MADE A GOOD START.

32. CANADIN REP STATED THAT HE WANTED TO ASK A CLARIFYING QUESTION. KHLESTOV HAD STATED THAT, ON THE BASIS OF THE ALLIED DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES LATTER HAD JUST HEARD, THAT ALLIES HAD NOT INCLUDED CIVILIANS WHO PERFORMED FUNCTIONS IN SOE OF THE ARMED SERVVICES. WHICH FUNCTIONS DID KHLESTOV HAVE IN MIND?

33. KHLESTOV SAID HE COULD ONLY FAULT CANADIAN REP'S

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03159 04 OF 06 091502Z

COLLEAGUES WHO HAD BEEN PRESENT ON THE LAST OCCASION, BECAUSE, IN THAT SESSION, EAST HAD RAISES THE QUESTION OF CIVILIANS IN THE WESTERN AND EASTERN MILITARY GROUPINGS AND HAD MENTIONED CONSIDERABLE NUMBERS OF THOSE CIVILIANS WHO IN THE WESTERN FORCES PERFORMED FUNCTIONS WHICH WERE PERFORMED IN THE CASE OF THE WARSAW PACT BY MILITARY PERSONNEL. CANADIAN REP SAID HE REMEMBERED THIS ISSUE. ON THAT OCCASION, ALLIED REPS HAD NOTED THAT MANY SUCH PERSONNEL WERE CHARWOMEN AND

TEACHERS. HE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HIGH CIVILIANS KHLESTOV WAS TALKING ABOUT SINCE CIVILIANS DID PERFORM A WIDE VARIETY OF FUNCTIONS.

34. KHLESTOV REPLIED THAT, IN MENTIONING CIVILIANS, HE HAD WANTED BRIEFLY TO REMIND ALLIED REPS OF THE BASIC IDEAS EASTERN REPS HAD MENTIONED ON THE LAST OCCASION. IN MAKING THEIR ESTIMATES OF THE GROUND FORCES OF NATO AND WARSAW PACT, ALLIED REPS HAD CITED SPECIFIC FIGURES. FROM THEM, IT WAS CLEAR THAT THE ALLIED WERE CONCENTRATING ONLY ON GROUND FORCES. FOR THEIR PART, EASTERN REPS HAD MAINTAINED THAT THE COMBAT CAPABILITY OF THE TWO ALLIANCES WAS COMPOSED OF VARIOUS MILITARY ELEMENTS. IF ONE WAS EVALUATING THIS, ONE HAD TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT ALL OF THE ELEMENTS WHICH COMPOSED THE MILITARY STRENGTH OF THE TWO ALLIANCES IN THE AREA. ON THAT OCCASION, EASTERN REPS HAD POINTED OUT THAT, BECAUSE OF A NUMBER OF POLITICAL, HISTORICAL, ECONOMIC, AND OTHER FACTORS, THE ARMED FORCES OF THE WARSAW PACT AND NATO DIFFERED IN THEIR STRUCTURE AND IN SOME OTHER RESPECTS. NONETHELESS, IF ONE WAS ESTIMATING THE COMBAT CAPABILITY OF THE TWO SIDES, ONE SHOULD TAKE INTO ACCOUNT ALL ELEMENTS WHICH HAVE A BEARING ON THIS. CONSEQUENTLY, EASTERN REPS HAD CITED AS AN EXAMPLE THAT NATO FORCES HAD A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF CIVILIANS SERVING WITH THEIR FORCES IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS. SOME 300,000 OF THEM PERFORMED A NUMBER OF FUNCTIONS FOR WESTERN TROOPS IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS, BOTH FOR FRG AND FOREIGN TROOPS. FOR INSTANCE, THERE WERE A NUMBER WITH BOTH CANADIAN AND US FORCES.

35. KHLESTOV CONTINUED THAT SOME OF THE FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY THESE CIVILIANS WERE, IN FACT, PERFORMED BY SERVICE MEN WEARING UNIFORMS IN THE SOVIET ARMED FORCES. SO ALL OF THIS HAD TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT. FOR EXAMPLE, REPAIR SHOPS FOR WEAPONS, OR HOSPITALS AND MEDICAL ESTABLISHMENTS. ALLIED REPS WERE  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03159 04 OF 06 091502Z

IN A BETTER POSITION TO KNOW THE DETAILS ON THIS. HE WAS FAR FROM IMPLYING THAT ALL OF THESE 300,000 CIVILIANS PERFORMED FUNCTIONS ALSO PERFORMED BY WARSAW PACT SERVICEMEN, BUT, UNDOUBTEDLY, SOME OF THE FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY CIVILIANS IN THE WEST WERE THE SAME AS THE FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY THE MILITARY IN THE WARSAW PACT. HE HAD NOT CITED THIS POINT IN ORDER TO CRITICIZE THE FIGURES GIVEN BY THE ALLIES AS CORRECT OR INCORRECT. HE HAD MERELY DESIRED TO EMPHASIZE IN THIS WAY THAT EACH OF THE ALLIANCES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED ON THE BASIS OF ALL ELEMENTS COMPOSING THEM.

36. UK REP SAID HE HAD SOME DIFFICULTIES WITH THIS APPROACH. IF THE IDEA OF CIVILIANS WERE INTRODUCED, IT WOULD GO A LONG WAY BEYOND THE TERMS AGREED IN THE COMMUNIQUE OF JUNE 28 WHICH REFERRED SPECIFICALLY TO ARMED FORCES AND TO ARMED FORCES

ONLY. ALL THE WESTERN CONSIDERATIONS IN THESE NEGOTIATIONS WERE RELATED SPECIFICALLY TO THIS TITLE. OF COURSE, THERE WERE DIFFERENCES ON THIS POINT. THE ALLIES TOO HAD POINTED OUT THAT PARTICIPANTS DID NOT AGREE ON WHICH ARMED FORCES SHOULD BE REDUCED. BUT THAT MADE NO DIFFERENCE WITH REGARD TO THE FACT THAT THE AGREED SUBJECT OF THE NEGOTIATIONS WAS REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES. THIS PLAINLY DID NOT INCLUDE CIVILIANS. UK REP SAID HAVING MADE THAT CLEAR POINT, HE DID NOT WISH TO LEAVE THE ISSUE SOLELY ON THAT JURIDICAL BASIS, VALID THOUGH IT WAS, BUT WISHED TO ADD THE POINT THAT EASTERN REPS WERE RAISING ISSUE OF PEOPLE WHO WERE NOT COMBAT TRAINED AND WOULD NOT BE USED IN WAR FOR COMBAT PURPOSES. IN EFFECT, KHLESTOV WAS ASKING ALLIES TO COMPARE CIVILIANS WITH WARSAW PACT MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THIS REGARD. THIRDLY, IF EAST STARTED WITH IDEA OF TRYING TO EXTEND REDUCTIONS TO CIVILIANS EMPLOYED BY THE ARMED FORCES, PARTICIPANTS WOULD COME UP AGAINST THE QUESTION OF "WHAT IS A CIVILIAN?" OR "WHICH CIVILIANS?" WERE CIVILIANS WITH MILITARY TRAINING OR PARAMILITARY TRAINING MORE OR LESS RELEVANT THAN THOSE WITH HOSPITAL OR MEDICAL TRAINING? TO PURSUE THIS LINE WOULD BE TO OPEN A LARGE AND ILL-DEFINED AREA WHICH WOULD INCREASE THE COMPLEXITY OF THE NEGOTIATIONS.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03159 05 OF 06 091452Z

41

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03

INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03

SS-20 USIA-15 NEA-10 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04

AEC-11 AECE-00 OMB-01 SAM-01 DRC-01 /162 W

----- 015591

P 091222Z APR 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2402

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 5 OF 6 VIENNA 3159

FROM US REP MBFR

HE WOULD THEREFORE LIKE TO COME BACK TO THE FIRST POINT, THAT LAST YEAR AFTER LONG DISCUSSION, PARTICIPANTS HAD AGREED THAT THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD BE REDUCTIONS OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS. THEY HAD AGREED ON THE TITLE OF "ARMED FORCES" AND THEY SHOULD STICK TO THAT.

37. KHLESTOV SAID IT HAD NOT BEEN HIS IDEA TO PROPOSE REDUCTION OF CIVILIANS. ALLIED REPS SHOULD HAVE NO CONCERNS AS TO THIS SCORE. BOTH SIDES HAD THE SAME POSITION. NO ONE WISHED TO REDUCE CIVILIANS. BUT EASTERN REPS HAD MENTIONED THIS ISSUE ONLY IN CONNECTION WITH THE ISSUE OF HOW TO ESTABLISH THE MILITARY CAPABILITY OF EACH GROUP. EASTERN REPS BELIEVED IT WAS NECESSARY TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT ALL FACTORS IN DOING SO. THE WESTERN APPROACH WAS TO PICK OUT ONLY ONE ELEMENT AND THEN TO COMPARE IT ON BOTH SIDES. THIS WAS UNSCIENTIFIC. PARTICIPANTS SHOULD TAKE INTO ACCOUNT ALL FACTORS WHICH MADE  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03159 05 OF 06 091452Z

UP THE MILITARY STRENGTH OF BOTH SIDES. THAT WAS WHY HE HAD MENTIONED THAT WEST HAD SOME CIVILIANS PERFORMING FUNCTIONS IN THEIR FORCES WHICH WERE PERFORMED BY UNIFORMED PERSONNEL IN THE WARSAW PACT FORCES. THIS POINT WAS WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE AGREED THEME OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. THE EAST WAS NOT TRYING TO FIGURE OUT A WAY TO REDUCE CIVILIANS.

38. POLISH REP SAID EAST HAD NOT INVENTED THE QUESTION OF CIVILIANS OR TAKEN THE INITIATIVE TO RAISE IT, BUT THE WEST IN PUSHING THE DISPARITIES HAD OBLIGED EAST TO MENTION THIS POINT AS ONE OF THE FACTORS WHICH HAD TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IF THE COMBAT CAPABILITY OF BOTH SIDES WERE BEING CONSIDERED.

39. UK REP SAID HE NOW UNDERSTOOD EASTERN POINT SOMEWHAT BETTER. BUT THE FACT REMAINED IT WAS VERY DIFFICULT TO BRING IN CIVILIANS IN ANY WAY. IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE TO COMPARE THEM WITH SERVICEMEN WHO WERE TRAINED IN THE USE OF WEAPONS. THIS COMPARISON WAS NOT A VALID ONE. EASTERN REPS WERE RIGHT TO SAY THAT WEST DID EMPLOY SOME CIVILIANS IN ONE CAPACITY OR ANOTHER, BUT THEY DID NOT CARRY WEAPONS AND COULD NOT BE USED IN COMBAT.

40. KHLESTOV SAID EASTERN REPS DID NOT PROPOSE COMPARING THE CAPABILITIES OF CIVILIANS AND THEIR FUNCTIONS IN BOTH ALLIANCES. THE ONLY REASON THEY HAD MENTIONED THE TOPIC WAS THAT THEY HAD WISHED TO ESTIMATE OR EVALUATE THE COMBAT CAPABILITY OF THE TROOPS IN THE AREA TAKING INTO ACCOUNT ALL RELEVANT FACTORS. WESTERN REPS ON THE OTHER HAND WERE TRYING TO COMPARE

THE COMBAT CAPABILITY OF BOTH SIDES ONLY ON THE BASIS OF ONE ISOLATED FORCE ELEMENT. THE EAST WAS TRYING TO POINT OUT THAT ALL ELEMENTS SHOULD BE INCLUDED. CIVILIANS STRENGTHENED THE WESTERN FORCES LOCATED WITHIN THE AREA AND PERFORMED SUPPORTING DUTIES WHICH IN THE WARSAW PACT WERE PERFORMED BY TROOPS IN UNIFORM. THIS WAS THE REASON EASTERN REPS HAD BROUGHT THE ISSUE UP.

41. US REP SAID THAT IF ONE WAS TAKING THE APPROACH THAT IT WAS DESIRABLE TO ASSESS THE MILITARY CAPABILITIES OF BOTH SIDES, ALLIED REPS THOUGHT IT IMPORTANT TO ASSESS THE COMBAT CAPABILITY OF GROUND FORCES. ALLIES HAD LEFT OUT CIVILIANS FROM THIS CALCULATION SINCE THEY WERE NOT COMBAT TRAINED, WOULD NOT PARTICIPATE IN COMBAT, AND HENCE HAD NO RELEVANCE TO COMBAT CAPABILITY. IF THE EASTERN

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03159 05 OF 06 091452Z

LOGIC WERE FOLLOWED, ONE SHOULD TAKE INTO ACCOUNT PARA-MILITARY PERSONNEL IN WHICH THE EAST HAD A CLEAR ADVANTAGE. ALLIED REPS THOUGHT THEY HAD BEEN EVEN-HANDED IN THEIR EVALUATION IN THAT THEY HAD LEFT OUT ALL OF THESE ELEMENTS AND HAD FOCUSSED ON THE UNIFORMED ARMED FORCES.

42. US REP CONTINUED THAT HE HAD ONE QUESTION ON THE EASTERN DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES. KHLESTOV HAD LISTED ARMY AIR FORCES IN HIS DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES. WERE THESE THE HELICOPTER FORCES? TO THIS, KHLESTOV REPLIED HE FEARED HE MIGHT BE IN ERROR OF HE ANSWERED THE QUESTION WITHOUT EXPERT ADVICE. US REP SAID HE WOULD THEN REQUEST THAT KHLESTOV ASK ABOUT THIS FURTHER. ALLIES HAD OMITTED WARSAW PACT HELICOPTERS BECAUSE THEY HAD BEEN CONSIDERED AS BELONGING TO THE AIR FORCES.

43. KHLESTOV SAID HE THOUGHT THAT WHEN THE EXPERTS MET AFTER THE BREAK THEY COULD EXCHANGE VIEWS ON THIS POINT. AS REGARDS US REP'S REMARK ON PARA-MILITARY FORMATIONS, WHAT DID HE HAVE IN MIND? US REP SAID HE HAD IN MIND CIVILIANS WITH MILITARY TRAINING. THESE MIGHT INCLUDE YOUTH GROUPS FOR PARA-MILITARY FORCES WHICH IN THE GDR COMPRISED FRONTIER TROOPS, ALERT POLICE, AND SECURITY GUARD REGIMENTS; AND IN POLAND, BORDER GUARDS, INTERNAL SECURITY FORCES, AND TERRITORIAL DEFENSE UNITS; AND IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA, FRONTIER GUARDS. THE ALLIES WERE NOT SUGGESTING THAT THESE FORCES SHOULD BE INCLUDED ON EITHER SIDE BECAUSE THE LINE HAD TO BE DRAWN BETWEEN THE ARMED SERVICES AND CIVILIANS. THE ALLIES CONSIDERED THAT THEIR DEFINITION OF UNIFORMED MILITARY SERVICES WAS A REASONABLE ONE. UK REP SAID ALLIED REPS WERE NOT SUGGESTING DISCUSSING CIVILIANS BUT, IF ONE WERE CONSIDERING CIVILIANS, WHAT US REP HAD POINTED TO WAS ONE OF THE ELEMENTS WHICH WOULD HAVE TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT. THE SIMPLEST WAY WAS TO DRAW THE LINE WITH THE ARMED SERVICES AND TO LEAVE IT AT THAT.

44. KHLESTOV SAID WHAT ALLIED REPS HAD SAID ABOUT PARA-MILITARY UNITS WAS NOT THE SAME POINT THAT HE HAD BEEN MAKING WITH REGARD TO CIVILIANS. PARTICIPANTS WERE DEALING WITH THE MILITARY UNITS OF THE TWO ALLIANCES WITH A VIEW TO REDUCING THESE UNITS. BUT IN ASSESSING THE COMBAT CAPABILITY OF THE TWO ALLIANCES, THE EAST HAD TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT ALL THE ELEMENTS INCLUDING MANPOWER. FOR INSTANCE, IN THE WARSAW PACT UNITS THERE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 03159 05 OF 06 091452Z

E E E E E E E

ADP000

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03159 06 OF 06 091440Z

41

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03

INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03

SS-20 USIA-15 NEA-10 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04

AEC-11 AECE-00 OMB-01 SAM-01 DRC-01 /162 W

----- 015443

P 091222Z APR 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2403

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 6 OF 6 VIENNA 3159

FROM US REP MBFR

THESE PERSONNEL HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN THE WESTERN ESTIMATES.

45. KHLESTOV SAID THAT, HOWEVER, IN THE WESTERN ALLIANCE, THERE WERE A NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL WHO PERFORMED THESE OR SIMILAR FUNCTIONS. THEY DID NOT WEAR UNIFORMS AND, THEREFORE, DID NOT FALL UNDER THE DEFINITION THAT ALLIED REPS HAD JUST GIVEN OF GROUND FORCES. NONETHELESS, AMONG THEM WERE SOME MEN WHO PERFORMED JOBS THAT ON THE PACT SIDE WERE PERFORMED

BY MEMBERS OF THE WARSAW PACT UNIFORMED FORCES. THUS, IN ASSESSING THE STRENGTH OF THE RESPECTIVE ALLIANCES, ONE COULD NOT OMIT THESE CIVILIANS. WHEN ALLIED REPS GAVE THEIR FIGURES ON MANPOWER, THEY INCLUDED IN THE WARSAW PACT ACCOUNT ALL THE PERSONNEL OF THIS TYPE, BUT FAILED TO DO SO FOR THEIR OWN SIDE. THIS POINT HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH THE ISSUE OF FORCES LIKE THE MILITIA.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03159 06 OF 06 091440Z

46. US REP SAID KHLESTOV HAD JUST SUGGESTED THE POSSIBILITY OF A FUNCTIONAL DEFINITION. APPARENTLY, HE WAS SUGGESTING INCLUDING ALL PERSONS, WHETHER CIVILIAN OR MILITARY EXERCISING CERTAIN SPECIFIED FUNCTIONS. HE HAD ALREADY POINTED OUT THAT WESTERN CIVILIANS WERE FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT FROM WARSAW PACT MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO EXERCISED CERTAIN FUNCTIONS IN THAT THE FORMER HAD NO COMBAT TRAINING AND WOULD HAVE NO COMBAT ROLE. BUT EVEN IF ONE DID USE A FUNCTIONAL DEFINITION, THEN ONE WOULD, FOR EXAMPLE, INCLUDE THE EAST GERMAN BORDER TROOPS, AMONG WHOSE MISSION WAS TO DEFEND THE GDR BORDER IN TIME OF WAR. THIS WAS SUBSTANTIALLY SAME MISSION AS THAT OF US CAVALRY RECONNAISSANCE UNITS STATIONED ON THE BORDER. IN THAT CASE, THERE WOULD BE MANY MORE PERSONNEL ON THE WARSAW PACT SIDE WHO HAD SUCH A COMBAT FUNCTION AND WHO HAD THE TRAINING TO BACK IT UP. HE THOUGHT IT WOULD BE BEST TO LEAVE OUT THIS ENTIRE CATEGORY AND TO OMIT ALL CIVILIANS.

47. KHLESTOV SAID HE DID NOT INTEND TO OPERATE WITH A FUNCTIONAL DEFINITION. WHAT US REP HAD JUST SAID INDICATED THE DIFFICULTIES OF SUCH AN APPROACH. THIS IDEA HAD NEVER OCCURRED TO THE EASTERN REPS. EASTERN REPS HAD MENTIONED THE ISSUE OF CIVILIANS ONLY BECAUSE IN THE ARMY UNITS OF THE TWO ALLIANCES THE ELEMENTS PERFORMING SIMILAR JOBS EXISTED, BUT, DESPITE THIS, WEST WAS CONTENDING THAT ONLY UNIFORMED SERVICEMENT SHOULD BE REDUCED. US REP SAID THAT IF ONE WISHED TO EXPAND THE DEFINITION OF UNIFORMED ARMED SERVICES, IT WOULD BE MORE LEGITIMATE TO INCLUDE THE EAST GERMAN FRONTIER GUARD WHO HAD A PARALLEL FUNCTION TO PERFORM WITH CERTAIN AMERICAN FORCES.

48. KHLESTOV NODDED HIS RECOGNITION OF THE FORCE OF THIS POINT.

49. US REP THEN COMMENTED THAT THE PRESENT SESSIONS HAD DEALT WITH A TECHNICAL TOPIC. ALLIED REPS EXPECTED TO RETURN AFTER THE RECESS TO GIVE PRIORITY ATTENTION TO RESOLVING THE TOPIC WHICH HAD BEEN AGREED IN THE LAST SESSION, THE ISSUE OF WHOSE FORCES SHOULD BE REDUCED FROM THE OUTSET. KHLESTOV INDICATED CONFIRMATION OF THIS UNDERSTANDING.

50. CANADIAN REP ASKED WHEN THE NEXT PLENARY SESSION WOULD BE HELD AFTER THAT SCHEDULED FOR APRIL 9. STRULAK SAID THAT THERE WAS TENTATIVE AGREEMENT THAT PARTICIPANTS WOULD MEET IN THE WEEK OF



SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03159 06 OF 06 091440Z

MAY 6TH, BUT AN ADDITIONAL UNOFFICIAL UNDERSTANDING, NOT TO  
BE PUBLICIZED, THAT THE NEXT PLENARY WOULD BE HELD ON MAY 10.  
HUMES

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** ARMED FORCES, GROUND FORCES, NEGOTIATIONS, MEETINGS, MEETING PROCEEDINGS, MEETING REPORTS, NUCLEAR WEAPONS, AIR FORCE, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS, CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES, TROOP REDUCTIONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 09 APR 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974VIENNA03159  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D740084-0404, D740080-1155  
**From:** VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740453/aaaabwrz.tel  
**Line Count:** 879  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 16  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** VIENNA 3158  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:** ANOMALY  
**Review Date:** 20 MAR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <20 MAR 2002 by collinp0>; APPROVED <06 MAY 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPS APRIL 8, 1974  
**TAGS:** PARM, XT, XH, UR, CA, US, NATO, WTO, NAC, MBFR  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005